



Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1994/SR.23
14 February 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Substantive session of 1994

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 23rd MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 6 July 1994, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. BUTLER

(Australia)

CONTENTS

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
COOPERATION (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION (continued) (A/49/204-E/1994/90, A/49/205-E/1994/91, E/1994/34, Parts I-III, E/1994/35, E/1994/64 and Add.1 and 2, E/1994/84, E/1994/93)

Ms. MESA (World Food Programme), speaking on behalf of the Joint Consultative Group on Policy (JCGP) regarding the suggestion made at the preceding meeting that JCGP should be asked to provide analytical reports and suggest topics for discussion by the Economic and Social Council, said that JCGP saw its role as one of providing input to the Council on issues of common relevance to the various funds and programmes. Some issues identified by the individual Executive Boards might not fall within the Group's purview, and issues of system-wide relevance to the funds, programmes and agencies could be identified by other inter-agency mechanisms.

JCGP would consider the suggestion at its next general meeting, in light of the decisions of the Council at its current session. The Group's decisions would then be brought to the attention of the Council.

After a discussion in which Mr. SORENSON (International Labour Organization), the PRESIDENT, Mrs. VASISHT (India), Mr. BARNETT (United Kingdom) and Mr. HEIN (Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations) took part, Mr. SORENSON (International Labour Organization) said that it would be appropriate for both JCGP and the Consultative Committee on Programme and Operational Questions (CCPOQ) to provide policy guidance to the Economic and Social Council on matters within their spheres of competence.

Mrs. VOLKOFF (Canada) welcomed the statement made on behalf of the JCGP. She also wondered whether any of the funds and programmes wished to offer their individual views on the subject.

Mr. GRAISSE (United Nations Development Programme) said that the Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme/United Nations Population Fund considered that its work was proceeding well. In consultations prior to the next organizational session of the Council, the Board might discuss what issues it should ask the Council to consider in the first instance, rather than take them up itself. The governing bodies of the United Nations development funds and programmes might consider that idea in informal discussions and inform the President of the Council of the outcome.

Mrs. AMERASEKARE (Sri Lanka) said that broad policy-making must be the task of the General Assembly, while policy decisions on the implementation of operational activities within the framework of the General Assembly resolutions were the purview of the Council. The Council also could make recommendations to the General Assembly on various issues. For example, it could consider whether the adoption of country strategy notes should be staggered to take into account the need to harmonize the notes with national development plans.

She was uncertain where the dividing line was between the operational activity segment and the coordination segment of the Council's deliberations. She also believed that the reports of the funding agencies to the Council should include a section on matters referred by their Executive Boards to the Council for consideration.

At the conclusion of the session, it would be useful for the President to provide the funding agencies with a summary reflecting the issues and concerns raised during the session, thereby enabling them to prepare analyses for the Council's use at its next session.

The PRESIDENT said that the distinction between the operational and coordination segments would become clearer as the debate in the current session progressed, particularly in the course of the informal consultations that were about to begin on the role of the Council in coordinating policy and strategies for operational activities pursuant to General Assembly resolution 48/162. At the current session, the coordination

segment would deal with the specific themes indicated in the documents relating to the agenda. The consultations also would address the form which decisions emerging from discussions during the operational segment should take.

Mr. YEGOROV (Belarus) praised the ongoing reform of the leading development bodies, which had thus far been quite successful. He shared the feeling of some delegations that the recent session of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Executive Board had not given sufficient consideration to implementation of General Assembly resolution 47/199 and the decisions adopted at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. On the whole, his delegation was satisfied with the discussions at the present session of the Council regarding a future programme of development for the United Nations. He wished to stress the provision in Executive Board resolution 94/14, which stated that national development priorities should play a key role in the composition of the country strategy notes and similar documents.

His delegation regretted the reduction in special programme resources for the fifth programming cycle and drew attention to the need to restore initial levels of resources.

Fruitful discussion regarding the sixth programming cycle had taken place at the June session of the UNDP Executive Board. Although that discussion had been of a preliminary nature, it was interesting from a conceptual and a methodological point of view.

It was important not to adopt decisions which were not fully worked out. His delegation had favoured the adoption of Executive Board resolution 94/17 regarding the sixth programming cycle, and stressed the importance of the principle of universality of access by all countries receiving assistance and of responding to the needs of all recipient countries in accordance with their own policies and priorities for development. The topic of the sixth programming cycle was closely linked to that of the future activities of the United Nations as a whole. His delegation therefore felt that serious

consideration should be given to the proposal to include the subject of the sixth programming cycle in the 1995 triennial review of operational activities.

His delegation praised the efforts of UNDP in Eastern Europe and the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and supported the proposal to reform the Division dealing with those countries as part of the organizational restructuring. His delegation also agreed with the suggestion that the reports of the Executive Boards of the various funds and programmes should contain special sections on subjects for discussion at the Economic and Social Council. Those topics should be of a general nature and should cover the entire United Nations development system.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.

In the absence of Mr. Butler (Australia), Mr. Botez (Romania),
Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

COORDINATION OF THE POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND
OTHER BODIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING THEME
(A/49/204-E/1994/90, A/49/205-E/1994/91):

(a) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (E/1994/70)

Mr. DESAI (Under-Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development), introducing the report contained in document E/1994/70, stressed the importance of scientific and technological capacities as the driving force of development. There were at least three reasons why that importance should be stressed even more than in the past: in an increasingly globalized and market-oriented world, technical capacity was the very basis of competitive strength; a true commitment to sustainable development required much greater efforts for the development, diffusion and application of environmentally sound technologies; and, given the emerging concern of people-centred development, there was a need to enhance the knowledge and skills of poorer households and to consider the impact of technical development on vulnerable groups.

The broad aims of the United Nations system's work in the field of science and technology were reflected in the three major objectives of the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development. Those objectives, together with a recognition of the field's vital importance, should provide a framework for the Council's discussion of coordination. Although coordination of highly technical activities was inevitably somewhat difficult, the new programme approach provided a basis for much more constructive assistance. One important question which should be addressed

under the coordination segment was the extent to which the United Nations system had successfully injected that approach, as well as national execution, into its work and adapted its mechanisms accordingly.

Mr. ROFFE (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)), noting the changes over the past two decades in perceptions of technology transfer and scientific development, said that the United Nations must recognize the crucial role of the enterprise sector for international cooperation in that field. While the role of Governments remained vital in the process of building technological capabilities, there was a need for closer collaboration between business, academic and government circles in order to incorporate the concerns of the production sector into policy formulation.

In terms of activities with which the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development had been associated, the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) had in 1993 decided to concentrate on three main substantive themes: (i) technology for small-scale activities to address the basic needs of low-income populations; (ii) gender implications of science and technology for developing countries; and (iii) the science and technology aspects of a sectoral issue to be discussed by the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) in 1995. Separate panels were working on each theme, and the Commission had decided to involve its members more directly in the preparation of the panels' reports. Meanwhile, the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Relationship between Investment and Technology Transfer had focused on investment flows, technology transfer, capacity-building, competitiveness and environmentally sound technology. In its final report, adopted in March 1994, the Group had offered a wide range of conclusions and recommendations which would guide the future work of UNCTAD and provide key inputs to CSTD, enhancing both the work of the Commission and the appropriate coordination of activities between intergovernmental bodies.

As a result of the restructuring exercise, the former Centre for Science and Technology for Development had been amalgamated into UNCTAD's renamed

Division for Science and Technology. The UNCTAD secretariat saw that move as consistent with the need for the organization to focus on areas where it had a comparative advantage. It also valued cooperation with other United Nations bodies and had enjoyed a particularly close and fruitful relationship with the Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development (DPCSD). Building on the already useful coordination of certain inputs between CSTD and the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), it might be useful to establish broad policy guidelines aimed at increasing the responsiveness of CSTD to the needs of CSD in areas where CSTD had evident competence. UNCTAD had also benefited from close cooperation with the regional commission and certain specialized agencies, often as a result of pragmatic arrangements rather than coordination imposed from above.

Successful coordination could not be achieved by using traditional instruments. It required a genuine understanding of new conditions, and recognition of other organizations' strengths and limits. It should be pragmatic and of benefit for all concerned, particularly the end-users.

Mr. BADRAN (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)) said effective coordination within the United Nations system required a rational division of labour based on the comparative advantages of each individual agency. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, for example, had traditional expertise in linking the promotion of basic, engineering and environmental sciences to activities in the field of education, culture, social sciences and communication. As such, it was well placed to address, for example, certain aspects of science and technology for development set out in Agenda 21. Committed as it was to using the programme approach to achieve more effective coordination at the national and regional levels, UNESCO had already been liaising with other United Nations bodies concerning the chapters of the Agenda for which it was to act as a task manager.

With regard to the improvement of coordination mechanisms in general, UNESCO believed there was an urgent need to organize a regular flow of

information on United Nations system activities in the field of science and technology at the national, regional and global levels, as well as close liaison with sources outside the system: an inter-agency ad hoc expert group should be created for that purpose. Also, all joint inter-agency projects in a given country should begin with the preparation of a policy analysis study, the results of which should be accessible to the international community through the country office of the corresponding resident coordinator. The primary aim of inter-agency cooperation should be to strengthen national capacities, while closely cooperating with business and industry. The ten pilot country projects on endogenous capacity-building should be carefully assessed by an ad hoc group with a view to drawing conclusions from that innovative inter-agency exercise. As an alternative to the creation of such specific ad hoc groups, thought might be given to the creation of an ad hoc inter-agency group attached to the Inter-Agency Committee on Sustainable Development (IACSD). Finally, it was essential to ensure complementarity between the Bretton Woods institutions and the specialized agencies.

Mr. HADID (Observer for Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, described the findings of the Secretary-General's report as disappointing. Firstly, it provided no overall framework for action and referred only once to the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development. The Programme remained relevant in many respects, and lack of implementation did not necessarily imply obsolescence. While the science and technology components of Agenda 21 did constitute new and important inputs, they fell short of providing the required global framework and already seemed to be undergoing an erosion process, due, inter alia, to an absence of adequate resources and endeavours to abolish CSD's Working Group on Technology.

Secondly, the figures mentioned in paragraph 21 of the report clearly demonstrated the very disturbing marginalization of science and technology in United Nations activities instead of, as would be logical, a regular increase in their share.

Thirdly, there was no convincing evidence to justify the abolition of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) Task Force on Science and Technology for Development. While ad hoc coordination mechanisms could play a useful role, it was unlikely they could make up for the abolition of the only overall mechanism existing in the area. Also, with regard to the work of CSTD and CSD, the allocation of secretariat functions to UNCTAD and of substantive responsibilities to DPCSD was at best artificial and ultimately self-defeating.

Fourthly, the complex administrative and financial procedures required to establish any formal inter-agency cooperative agreements should have been the subject of specific proposals rather than simply diagnosed, as in paragraph 110 of the report.

Finally, there was a need for concrete steps to achieve significant cooperation between United Nations bodies, including the regional commissions, and the subregional and regional integration groupings of developing countries in the field of science and technology for development.

Mr. GRAF ZU RANTZAU (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the discussion of science and technology should also focus on the Commission on Sustainable Development. The United Nations system's approach to coordination should parallel the Commission's decision, taken at its second session in May 1994, to stress the concrete significance of technology transfer, cooperation and capacity-building in sectoral issues. As science and technology-related issues were a structural element of all activities of the subsidiary bodies of the Council, a structural approach must be taken to increasing coordination.

Such increased coordination and harmonization of work should result in greater efficiency and less duplication, by, inter alia, deploying already existing resources. In addition, science and technology should be promoted through projects and programmes in which they were generated, transferred or applied, rather than through all-purpose funds such as the United Nations Fund for Science and Technology for Development. An important first step in that

direction had been the establishment of the Inter-agency Committee on Sustainable Development. UNCTAD could integrate efforts to coordinate science and technology system-wide on the basis of its already acquired expertise. The European Union welcomed the preliminary work done by UNCTAD's Ad Hoc Working Group on the Relationship between Investment and Technology Transfer, in particular its integrated approach to investment, technology transfer, environment and development. Task managers for sectoral issues should serve as focal points for science and technology. In so doing, they should not limit themselves to environmentally sound technologies; they should also be catalysts for an exchange of information. The European Union looked forward to the consultative meeting on a coalition of resources for science and technology to be held during the third quarter of 1994, organized by the Secretary-General following an initiative by the Commission for Science and Technology for Development. Such a coalition would enable different actors with a common interest in specific scientific or technology-related fields to share programmes through joint funding and implementation.

In times of budgetary constraint, it became important to adhere to the guidelines for priority-setting contained in Agenda 21, redefine programmes and adapt structures. That would liberate much-needed resources. The continuation of existing programmes which merely incorporated the terminology of Agenda 21 simply would not do. In seeking to promote change, the Inter-agency Committee on Sustainable Development should go beyond establishing general guidelines to provide concrete details for coordination, where necessary. To that end, its authority must be strengthened.

Similar changes must be introduced in intergovernmental structures. The new Commission on Science and Technology for Development must be rationalized further and its integration into the intergovernmental machinery of UNCTAD must take into account its linkages with the Commission on Sustainable Development and other United Nations bodies. A coherent approach must also be taken by the governing bodies of the United Nations system and the functional commissions of the Council. To that end, the subsidiary bodies of the Council

should synchronize the systematic analysis of their activities in the light of Agenda 21, including science and technology, with the multi-year thematic programme of work of the Commission on Sustainable Development. Structural coordination could be further enhanced by a certain degree of direct coordination among the subsidiary bodies of the Council. At the intergovernmental level, the Commission on Science and Technology for Development could serve as a forum for the necessary exchange of information. That Commission should provide concrete input for the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development, and the two should coordinate closely in order to avoid any possible duplication. Coordination of issues relating to science and technology must be strengthened at the regional level, in particular through the regional economic commissions.

Mr. HURIGUCHI (Japan) said that cooperation between research and policy-making organizations was particularly crucial. For example, representatives of such policy-making organizations as the Commission for Science and Technology for Development, the Commission on Sustainable Development, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development should participate in the research projects and activities of the United Nations University. A mechanism should be established to promote such coordination.

Coordination between the Council and all its different policy-making subsidiary bodies was essential to effective project execution. In that context, his delegation welcomed the working relationship established between the Chairmen of the Commission for Science and Technology for Development and the Commission on Sustainable Development. The policy-making organizations of the United Nations system must encourage the participation of all countries, particularly the recipient countries. National policy makers must also ensure that their policies were consistent with agreements formulated at the international level.

As the Task Force on Science and Technology for Development of the Administrative Committee on Coordination had noted, organizations engaged in

project execution must coordinate their medium-term plans, programme budgets and budget cycles. At the country level, the resident coordinator system must be strengthened and each organization must make every effort to appoint field-level staff of the highest calibre.

Linkages between the assistance programmes of the United Nations organizations, the World Bank and regional development banks must be strengthened. United Nations organizations must also improve their relationships with the relevant non-governmental organizations. Coordination was no easy task and would take time to achieve. The Economic and Social Council could best fulfil its coordinating role by encouraging organizational reform where necessary. In the current context, it must respond creatively and flexibly to the many changes taking place in the world and to the challenges posed by the Agreement on Global Governance incorporated into Agenda 21.

Dr. SZCZERBAN (World Health Organization (WHO)) said that the global political, socio-economic, environmental and epidemiological transition had had an adverse effect on health. The transition had been characterized by continuing "low-intensity warfare" and local conflicts, which were the symptoms of militarization in some developing countries; the export of polluting technologies to the third world; rising unemployment; and decreasing public expenditure on health care against a backdrop of rising costs. The high cost of health care had created gross inequities within countries, but particularly between the developing and industrialized countries. The problem called for urgent political attention at the global level, and, in particular, an efficient use of technology. The reform of health care systems at the national level was an encouraging sign. On a global scale, military expenditures must still be rechannelled into social - i.e., public health - welfare.

As it became increasingly multisectoral, health research must benefit from partnerships between the public sector and the private sector, the academic and industrial communities and institutions in the North and in the

South. It must involve not only ministries of health but also a number of other ministries and governmental agencies responsible for such sectors as education, science and technology and planning. It was of paramount importance to obtain a national commitment at the highest level to providing support for research capacity. External support for health and the strengthening of research capacity should be viewed as a complement to national support.

WHO, a scientifically-oriented organization, considered research an integral part of all its programming activities. It believed that the endogenous research capacity of developing countries must also be strengthened. It was time for an alternative approach to "unaffordability" and "non-feasibility", one which did not distinguish between science for the rich and science for the poor and did not merely maintain the developing world on the "consumer" side but rather stimulated its creative intellectual development. Investment in the intellectual resources of developing countries would help to make development self-perpetuating. In that context, he agreed with the Secretary-General that the strengthening of national capacity should take an interdisciplinary rather than a sectoral approach. Designated focal points for science and technology within cooperating agencies must be supported by expert scientific advisory bodies. Their objectives should include strengthening the development of science and research policies and strategies and coordinating different organizations' research and technological policies with those of other United Nations bodies and non-governmental organizations.

Mr. SREENIVASAN (India) expressed his delegation's support for the statement delivered by the Algerian representative on behalf of the Group of 77. His delegation also endorsed the broad approach to coordination outlined in the report of the Secretary-General (E/1994/70). However, the report showed that very little coordination was taking place at the operational level and hardly any in the area of science and technology for development. To some extent, it was true that scientifically advanced

countries were unwilling to cooperate through the United Nations system with a view to building up science and technology in developing countries. However, more must be done by the concerned United Nations agencies, funds and programmes in order to sensitize the international community to the crucial catalytic role it must play. That process could not be left to the private sector alone.

In that context, the United Nations Fund for Science and Technology for Development must be strengthened. Greater emphasis should be placed on applied research and development and on ensuring that the results of such activities were filtered down to industries and users. To that end, activities should be encouraged to expand research from a bench-scale to a pilot level. The preference of developing countries for often obsolete technology which required a low initial capital investment perpetuated their relationship of dependence. The United Nations must help those countries to choose technology more effectively.

Additional efforts must be made to facilitate the South-South transfer of technology. Otherwise, the funds allocated for that purpose would be ploughed back to the developed countries through the delivery of equipment, machinery and the cost of technical manpower. The United Nations system should also publish a catalogue for use by developing countries in procuring state-of-the-art technology. His delegation did not fully agree with the Secretary-General that science and technology should be viewed from a sectoral perspective rather than generically. While the sectoral dimension was important, basic scientific and technological research was equally vital. In the decision it adopted, the Council should recognize the important role of science and technology, express concern at the lack of activity in that area and call for further efforts by the international community and the United Nations system to integrate science and technology effectively into the development process.

Ms. DOWDESWELL (United Nations Environment Programme) referred to a paper which described the role of science and technology in UNEP

activities - from sensing, interpreting and understanding the state of the environment to developing analytical and management tools. The paper also analysed international public policies in such areas as ozone layer protection, conservation of biological diversity and the emerging issues of trade and the environment. It described other aspects of the Programme's work, including Earthwatch, the International Environmental Technology Centre in Japan and the transfer of cleaner production processes to a number of countries.

A number of factors must be recognized in order to realize the full potential of science and technology for sustainable development. One such factor was the gap between the physical sciences, which provided information, and the behavioural sciences, which stressed value judgements and cultural questions such as lifestyle choices. It would also be important to recognize that the problems to be addressed were not sectoral but rather multidisciplinary in nature and could not be solved during the term of any single Government. Lastly, the effect of global interdependence on the environment must be understood.

Against that backdrop, she wished to offer a number of suggestions. While she welcomed the inclusion of science and technology in the agenda of the Commission on Sustainable Development, reporting was only one step towards coordination. On a more concrete level, the Commission had requested UNEP and other organizations to collaborate on a survey and assessment of environmentally sound technologies which were patented or in the public domain. The objective was to identify and correct gaps and deficiencies in information sources with a view to improving their effectiveness and expanding access to them. She hoped that the Council would encourage further action of that type, if necessary by proposing structural changes in the various funds and programmes.

Science and technology in and of themselves were not the answer. To understand how to use them more effectively, the international community must focus on changes in attitude and behaviour through a worldwide programme

of environmental citizenship. The capacity to use emerging science and technology and technological solutions appropriate for developing countries must be increased. Furthermore, all potential actors must be involved in the process - industry, business, the scientific community, women and indigenous peoples. Networks must be nurtured and used effectively.

While science allowed the forecasting of future opportunities and risks, it must be more forceful in influencing public policy decisions, particularly in the economic sphere. One pragmatic approach to that objective was to develop and apply indicators. Indicators could measure progress being achieved in sustainable development and could help to mobilize broad public support, a necessary ingredient for political action. Sensitive indicators would ensure that new techniques for monitoring environmental change were generated for assessing the impact of present and proposed actions on the natural and social environment.

Science and technology were crucial to sustainable human development, but to realize fully their potential, barriers between disciplines and organizations must be broken down. It must be recognized that progress occurred when science was linked to human behaviour.

Mr. MOJOUKHOV (Belarus) said his delegation endorsed the new approaches for improving coordination and cooperation in the field of science and technology for development, based on complementarity of the partners and a recognition of the ways in which scientific and technical cooperation differed. Commenting on the report of the Secretary-General (E/1994/70), he noted that the wide range of mandates related to science and technology emphasized the need for a clear division of labour and more effective coordination of policies at all levels. Now that a decision had been made to establish a new division of labour, an alternative coordination mechanism must be established.

Despite restructuring reforms at the intergovernmental level, such as the formation of a single Commission for Science and Technology for Development and other structural reforms of the Secretariat and inter-agency

mechanisms of the Administrative Committee on Coordination, problems of fragmentation of efforts within the United Nations system, the lack of political and financial resources and the need for budgetary coordination for mid-term programmes and projects still remained. His delegation noted with some regret that the Secretary-General's report (E/1994/70) had not even mentioned an Agenda for development and hoped that there would be a greater effort in the future to link the field of science and technology to the process of development.

While recognizing the need for greater coordination between the legislative and policy-making bodies, his delegation did not share the view that the Inter-agency Committee on Sustainable Development should be the principal intermediary between the specialized agencies and the Council. However, his delegation did agree with the long-term goals of coordination set forth in paragraph 70 of the Secretary-General's report (E/1994/70) and endorsed the view that centralized coordination of all science and technology activities in the United Nations system was not feasible or even desirable and that the focus of coordination must be on specific areas involving more than one agency. His delegation supported the suggestion that the role of the Economic and Social Council should be strengthened as a forum for coordination among all policy-making bodies of the United Nations concerned with science and technology.

His delegation was ready to recognize that ACC was the coordinating body at the highest level within the United Nations system, as long as coordination at the global level was based on the specific measures suggested by the former ACC Task Force on Science and Technology for Development, set forth in paragraph 84 of the report. Inter-agency coordination at the regional level could only be effective if the necessary resources were provided. For example, the Economic Commission for Europe currently received the lowest amount of financing of all five regional commissions, a situation which his delegation regarded as completely unacceptable. Finally, inter-agency coordination at the country level was a critical factor for effective overall

coordination. The roles of the United Nations resident coordinators and UNDP resident representatives could vary from country to country, but a primary goal of coordination at the country level had to be the strengthening of national capacities during periods of transition and instability and the development of new fields such as computer technology, biotechnology and nuclear safety.

In conclusion, his delegation proposed that, at its forty-ninth session, the General Assembly should review and revise Programme 17 on science and technology for development of the United Nations medium-term plan for the period 1992-1997, and Subprogramme 3 on coordination and harmonization of activities of the United Nations system on science and technology, together with decisions that would be adopted during the current session of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. OKALI (United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) (UNCHS)) said that Habitat's efforts to promote appropriate and environmentally sound technologies had focused on the critical areas of developing a policy environment at the national and local levels supportive of appropriate technologies for settlement, development and management, building capacity at the national and local level for the acquisition and effective application of technologies, and promoting innovative technology transfer mechanisms through international cooperation. In the energy sector, it had focused on improving the efficiency of energy use and on promoting renewable low-pollution energy technologies. In the field of environmental infrastructure, activities had been concentrated in water conservation technologies, low-cost sewerage and small-scale waste recycling. Low-cost shallow sewerage technology developed by UNCHS was now widely used in high-density low-income urban settlements in developing countries. To facilitate planning and management in disaster-prone areas, Habitat had recently developed a versatile, optical disk storage system for the purpose of upgrading settlements. UNCHS had also actively pursued environmental concerns in the construction sector by promoting the improved management of

non-renewable resources, controlling physical disruption caused by such work, and minimizing atmospheric pollution.

Habitat had learned some key lessons which had implications for coordination. First, technology transition in human settlements was best managed through a combination of bottom-up and top-down approaches. therefore, cooperation within the United Nations system should focus on the involvement and participation of community-based and non-governmental organizations. At the national level, policy in the area of human settlements technology must be based on a multidisciplinary approach incorporating human settlements, environment and health. The United Nations system could coordinate action in that area at the international level. Equitable access to technologies on the part of all citizens, especially the urban poor, could be achieved by incorporating its social costs in cost-benefit analyses and pricing policies. Identifying options which combined socio-economic gains with environmental benefits should be a central objective. A range of "low-tech" environmentally sound technologies were already available and could be transferred to developing countries at a nominal licensing fee through established channels. International action should be directed at national capacity-building in those critical areas to facilitate such transfer of technology.

As the task manager for human settlements in the implementation of Agenda 21, Habitat was working closely with the Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development and other relevant agencies to improve coordination within the United Nations system. It placed special emphasis on new alliances with the private sector and business community, non-governmental organizations and local community groups.

Mr. BAILLARGEON (Canada) said that document E/1994/70 contained much useful information, but that a bewildering number of United Nations bodies had some degree of involvement in science and technology. The need for greater coordination among them was evident, but his delegation was unsure whether the proposals in section V would result in progress. A concise

listing of specific recommendations might have been more useful. Canada would argue against the creation of any new coordination mechanisms; instead, the effectiveness of existing mechanisms should be enhanced.

An important basic principle was that Government-assisted science and technology activities should be based on the needs of the private sector and should be directly applicable to market products and processes. They should also be competitive in the sense that the technology should not only be economically viable but should contribute to an enhanced standard of living. Such activity should expand society's pool of knowledge and stimulate further learning and should take place within the framework of sustainable development.

In considering science and technology coordination, priority should be given to the global and country levels, where policy was established and development actually took place. His delegation strongly supported the contention that the Economic and Social Council should be the forum for coordination among all policy-making bodies concerned with technology and development. All intergovernmental bodies involved should be encouraged to work toward a common agenda on science and technology issues. As a starting-point, all such bodies could take into account the agenda of the Commission on Sustainable Development for its work relating to technology, which extended to 1997. In order to improve inter-agency coordination, the Inter-agency Committee on Sustainable Development should make its reports more generally available. At the country level, the resident coordinator system should fulfil the necessary coordinating role.

The question of endogenous capacity-building should be at the heart of United Nations activities. His delegation supported the decision of the Commission on Sustainable Development to encourage the establishment of environmental technology centres in order to promote the development, transfer and adaptation of environmentally sound technologies. Other issues to be considered included the need to assess and prioritize science and technology activities at the country level, the particular relevance of the programme

approach to that sector, the problem of inadequate local demand for locally produced technologies and the need for a policy concerning the ownership of intellectual property rights developed during United Nations-financed activities.

One of the key constraints on United Nations capacity-building activities was that transfer of technology was not generally market-driven. Much more attention should be paid to the private sector dimension of science and technology for development and the establishment of linkages with that sector, as well as with the education and research sectors. Such outside groups should be permitted to participate actively in the work of the United Nations in coordinating science and technology activities at both the global and country levels.

Mr. CAMARA (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)) said that one of the main goals of the United Nations system was to narrow the material gap that separated the developing countries from the industrialized countries. Science and technology were two indispensable tools for the pursuit of that goal. Concerns arising in recent years over food security, the environment, energy resources and the sustainability of production systems demanded the diligent pursuit of scientific knowledge and its application to agriculture. Demographic change in many developing countries was leading to the cultivation of marginal lands and fragile ecosystems with serious repercussions on the environment. Research must be directed towards promoting increases in productivity in high potential areas and targeting marginal and fragile environments where degradation must be reversed and production stabilized.

The great challenge facing most developing countries was increasing the supply of food and other agricultural products while maintaining a cost-effective and sustainable production system. Since solutions must come from national efforts, the primary focus of FAO had been on strengthening national capacity and cooperation among countries in research and technology

development through education, training and technical cooperation among developing countries.

Over the years, FAO had formed alliance with specialized agencies within and outside the United Nations system. Its experience had shown that, while coordination was important, the emphasis on centralized coordination was exaggerated, and could result in a waste of human, material and financial resources. Science and technology should not be treated as a sector in itself, but rather as a tool for social and economic development. Coordination was more productive when it was carried out at the country level and linked with endogenous capacity-building as part of a country programme. The challenges of coordinating a cross-sectoral issue of that type could be met only if the respective mandates of the United Nations system organizations were respected. Such mandates were a blueprint for the division of labour within the system based on respective areas of competence. Where mandates did overlap, bilateral or trilateral agreements had proven more effective than system-wide exercises. Member States must take consistent and coherent positions in the various governing bodies of the United Nations system. The Economic and Social Council would be the appropriate body where coordination problems at the intergovernmental level could be resolved.

Mr. VOICU (Romania) noted that the subject of the contribution of science and technology to the progress of mankind had been an ongoing concern of the international community for decades. Resolutions on the subject had been passed as early as 1970. In more recent times, General Assembly resolution 48/179 had stressed the urgent need to strengthen the vital role of the United Nations in the field of science and technology, particularly through better coordination, including the field of technology assessment, monitoring and forecasting. His delegation therefore supported fully the proposals made by the Secretary-General in his report concerning steps to be taken to strengthen coordination, interaction and cooperation mechanisms. While it commended the efforts to improve coordination between the Commission for Science and Technology for Development and the Commission on Sustainable

Development, his delegation hoped that the value of coordination with the new Commission on International Investment and Transnational Corporations and the regional commissions would not be underestimated.

As noted in paragraph 101 of the Secretary-General's report, experience had shown that the minimum requirement for improved coordination was the exchange of information on a more regular, systematic basis. Thus, an integrated information network and regular means of communication were essential. Global coordination was inconceivable without global information. Romania shared the Secretary-General's view that successful coordination would be impossible without the will to work together. It was not enough to establish mechanisms and structures to eliminate duplication, overlap and inconsistency. Institutions must be ready to work as partners rather than rivals and to have the courage to measure the success of their efforts against the progress achieved.

Mr. VENKATARAMAN (United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)) said that the flow of technology, whether in the form of knowledge or equipment, to the developing countries had diminished in recent years. Government allocations for scientific and technological research had remained stagnant and many developing countries did not dispose of the foreign exchange resources needed to buy new equipment or upgrade research tools. At a time when developing countries were striving to keep pace with world scientific and technological progress, they faced a real danger that science and technology was becoming marginalized in these countries. In that regard, the United Nations system should place science and technology in the mainstream of development and of international cooperation and make a united effort to link science and technology more closely to the productive sectors of industry and agriculture.

The objectives of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization comprised industrial and technological growth and competitiveness, human resources development for industry, environmentally sustainable industrial growth and international cooperation in industrial investments and technology.

In its restructured context, UNIDO was seeking partnership with other agencies, such as the United Nations Environment Programme, the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. For example, UNIDO, in cooperation with UNEP had launched a new programme to support national cleaner production centres which would provide technical information and advice, stimulate demonstration of cleaner production techniques and technologies and train industry and government professionals. Similarly UNIDO had participated in the organization of an international conference on economic growth with clean production in Melbourne, Australia, which had drawn up a set of guiding principles for achieving economically sustainable industrial development, with emphasis on the importance of cooperation between Governments, industries and research institutions in the developed and developing countries alike.

Mr. AHMED (Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific) said that the strategy for cooperation, particularly at the regional level, should emphasize the complementarity between agencies. For example, UNIDO's comparative advantage in critical research and selected technical areas and that of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) in thematic coverage and close links with authorities of countries in the region provided an ideal opportunity for the promotion of science and technology in the industrial field. New avenues of cooperation were being developed through the successful and cost-effective UNIDO-FAO-ESCAP regional network for agricultural machinery, which combined elements of networking, sharing of expertise, and joint financing.

The role of cooperation in the field of science and technology should not be limited to industrial development. For example, ESCAP had initiated joint programmes with several agencies in the field of space technology and remote-sensing. ESCAP had taken the lead in organizing an inter-agency meeting on strengthening coordination at the regional level in May 1994, which had discussed a proposal to establish an inter-agency committee on industry and technology in which relevant United Nations agencies would participate.

As a first practical step towards operationalizing inter-agency coordination in science and technology for development, there should be an established system of regular information exchange for programmes, activities and financing arrangements so that the administrative and technical information required for implementation could be adequately diffused through each organization to member States and users at the national level. Secondly, existing resources for different United Nations agencies concerned should be pooled to finance joint research activities so as to stimulate a new spirit of collaboration among the different organizations. Finally, simplifying administrative and financial procedures between agencies would reduce the complexities involved in formulating inter-agency agreements.

Mr. BAKJAJI (Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA)) said that the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia had been more successful in coordinating its activities in the field of science and technology with the specialized agencies than with the components of the United Nations Secretariat. The restructuring of the Secretariat had affected most of those offices and programmes directly concerned with science and technology. ESCWA which, before the restructuring, had achieved an appreciable amount of coordination with CSTD, now had to consider how to coordinate with UNCTAD, DPCSD and the newly formed Commission on Sustainable Development and Commission for Science and Technology for Development. In that regard, his delegation strongly supported the recommendations made by the former ACC Task Force on Science and Technology for Development regarding coordination at the Headquarters level.

While the region of Western Asia was well endowed with valuable natural resources, it suffered from desertification and shortages of drinking water, and, although it was first among the developing countries in terms of investment and spending, it was plagued with acute unemployment, especially among the educated. The problems of the war-torn areas and escalating unemployment required special consideration. Both problems had strong science

and technology elements and required highly qualified expertise and a series of development activities.

In conclusion, he suggested that the representatives of ESCWA, other commissions and relevant organizations form a coordination committee to agree on specific tasks for implementation at the regional level and the role of each organization during each biennium.

Mr. MARTYNENKO (Ukraine) said his delegation welcomed the results of the first session of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development and agreed that the objective of system-wide coordination in science and technology should be specific programmes for cooperation. In that regard, there should be a distinct division of labour on the basis of comparative advantages and areas of competence and a more effective division of coordinating tasks at the intergovernmental level. His delegation hoped that the current session of the Council would suggest specific proposals to establish an intergovernmental mechanism for coordination.

His delegation welcomed the high level of coordination and complementarity of the programmes of the Commission for Science and Technology for Development and the Economic Commission for Europe. His delegation would endorse a programme of activity directed at increasing national potential in the field of science and technology. It hoped that programmes of multilateral scientific and technical cooperation would be designed for the areas of conversion of military technology for civilian purposes and of new technologies for energy sources, which were of particular interest to his country. Having learned the tragic lessons of the Chernobyl catastrophe, his Government understood the need to modernize the country's overall energy industry, by introducing new technologies for energy sources and achieving greater security of its nuclear energy facilities, in terms both of the environment and of the population. His delegation hoped it would enjoy the cooperation of the international community in meeting those challenges.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.



Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1994/SR.25

14 February 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Substantive session of 1994

Coordination segment

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 8 July 1994, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. BOTEZ
(Vice-President)

(Romania)

CONTENTS

COORDINATION OF THE POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND
OTHER BODIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM (continued):

(a) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

In the absence of the President, Mr Botez (Romania), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

COORDINATION OF THE POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND OTHER BODIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM (continued) (A/49/204-E/1994/90, A/49/205-E/1994/91):

(a) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (E/1994/70) (continued)

Mr. DZUNDEV (Observer for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) said that coordination at the country level - the most difficult area of coordination - was essential for countries in transition to a market economy. That was why the role of the United Nations Resident Coordinator should be strengthened in order to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of United Nations activities at the field level. His Government was willing to host a country office of the United Nations Development Programme which would be responsible, among other things, for science and technology. Unfortunately, his country's efforts to develop science and technology had been hampered by external factors. Although the United Nations system should continue to develop activities geared towards the advancement of science and technology, his delegation emphasized the need to transfer science and technology to countries in transition and developing countries. It was also important to pay more attention to the provision of scientific and technological cooperation through the regional commissions.

Mr. CHAMBERS (International Labour Organisation (ILO)) said that the increasing globalization of production sparked by high technology called for concerted, coordinated action within the United Nations system. Contrary to popular belief, new technologies such as biotechnology and information

technology had created job opportunities throughout the world. However, since the new technologies had enormous implications for changing occupational structures and skill requirements in both developed and developing countries, continuous monitoring of that trend was of vital importance. ILO intended to pay increasing attention to that aspect in the future. Other areas of concern to ILO in the field of science and technology included the impact of technological change on working conditions and the environment, training needs for the utilization of new technologies, the gender implications of science and technology, technologies for small-scale economic activities for low-income populations, and environmentally sound technologies.

Mr. BASMADJIEV (Bulgaria) said that it was essential to combine the potential of different countries in the area of science and technology in order to promote development. Capacity-building in science and technology was crucial for countries undergoing economic difficulties, particularly those with economies in transition. Access on concessional terms to advanced technologies would help such countries to overcome some of their economic readjustment problems. His delegation believed that under its new format, the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) would achieve tangible results in the promotion of international cooperation for scientific and technological progress. However, the new role of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in science and technology should not undermine the Commission's role in that regard.

The issues of science and technology to be discussed by the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) at its 1995 session would make it possible to establish the link between access to environmentally sound technologies and sustainable development. Therefore, CSTD and CSD should coordinate their work closely in order to avoid overlapping. He expressed interest in the activities of the United Nations system to promote and develop regional, subregional and national information capabilities to facilitate access to modern production technologies and supported the proposal to create a coordination mechanism for financing activities in that field in countries in

transition and other countries experiencing economic difficulties. He also stressed the need to improve the exchange of information and the pooling of resources within the United Nations system.

Mr. FLORENCIO (Brazil) said that while the private sector had an unquestionable role to play in the development of new technologies, the State had traditionally played a catalytic, promotional role in that regard. It was equally undeniable that the United Nations had a similar role to play in the transfer of scientific and technological capacities to developing countries. He was therefore disappointed that the report of the Secretary-General (E/1994/70) offered very little by way of concrete recommendations for enhancing the capabilities of the United Nations system through improved coordination. The report could have indicated how the bodies of the United Nations system might contribute in a coordinated manner to the elaboration and subsequent implementation of an Agenda for Development in the field of science and technology. Any effort to improve coordination among United Nations bodies in the field of science and technology would have to address the increasing marginalization of that field within the United Nations, a marginalization reflected in the limited financial resources allocated to it when compared with other areas listed in the report. The United Nations system should also provide adequate support to science and technology initiatives within the framework of technical cooperation among developing countries.

Mr. PONIKIEWSKI (Poland) said that several member countries seemed to have identified the transfer of environmentally sound technologies as a priority. One of the major weaknesses of the United Nations activities in the field of science and technology seemed to be access to information by Member States. In that connection, programmes such as the International Environment Information System (INFOTERRA) should be publicized widely in order for countries to take full advantage of them.

Referring to paragraph 34 of the report of the Secretary-General (E/1994/70), he said that the time had perhaps come to reconsider the

usefulness of United Nations intergovernmental forums in general. While he agreed that there was a further need to consolidate and harmonize such intergovernmental machinery, he cautioned against the proliferation of bodies dealing with different aspects of science and technology for development. He also agreed that the regional commissions should be more involved in activities undertaken at the country level in their respective regions. He would like more information on the specific catalytic role played by the United Nations system in the field of science and technology. Referring to the difficulties of inter-agency coordination in that field, he suggested that they might be caused by a lack of appropriate information concerning the corresponding United Nations activities and initiatives. In that connection, he endorsed the proposal by some agencies to establish a single focal point to act as a clearing house for science and technology within the United Nations system. While inter-agency cooperation in the area of advanced technologies such as biotechnology and information sciences should be strengthened at the country level, he wondered whether the United Nations had the means and the expertise to involve itself more fully in those areas. He would like further information on the proposal by the Secretary-General for an integrated inter-agency information network.

Ms. WILLIAMS-MANIGAULT (United States of America) said that her delegation generally supported the report of the Secretary-General on science and technology (E/1994/70), particularly the suggestions in section V. Noting the generic nature of science and technology activities, she said that while comprehensive centralized management of all such activities within the United Nations system was not desirable, the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) would be the most suitable body for coordinating them. The United States supported a stronger, more organic relationship between CSD and the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD). She looked forward to enhanced coordination between the two bodies and to a greater role for CSD as the focal point for coordination of United Nations science and technology activities, building on the promotion of environmentally sound

technologies as a central aim of the Organization's efforts in that field. At the inter-agency level, she supported the efforts of the Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development as task manager for the transfer of environmentally sound technologies. Her delegation felt that UNDP should play the lead role in operational coordination of United Nations science and technology activities at the country level in support of national capacity-building for development.

Mr. RUDENSKY (Russian Federation) said that the report of the Secretary-General (E/1994/70) provided an excellent basis for consideration of the subject under discussion, given the leading role which science and technology would play in the twenty-first century. The goal of sustainable development must provide the foundation for inter-agency coordination within a framework of scientific and technological progress.

The Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) should be concerned not only with intersectoral problems of international cooperation but should also formulate global conceptual approaches to the problems of science and technology within the framework of a single, coordinated system.

The Commission on Sustainable Development was considering relevant conceptual issues such as the transfer of technology for sustainable development. It should be called upon to provide periodic analyses of the overall situation regarding science and technology and of priorities for national policies, with a view to establishing a sound basis for coordination within the United Nations system and for the coordination of policies for sustainable development.

It was important clearly to define the functions of the Commission of Science and Technology for Development, bearing in mind the discussion of technology transfer in the Commission's inter-sessional meetings on financial resources and sectoral questions and the decisions of the Commission on Sustainable Development to deal with the transfer of technology as well. The latter body's panel should concentrate primarily on determining the ecological

safety of possibly destructive technologies and on preparing the corresponding recommendations.

It was also important clearly to define the functions of the UNCTAD Ad Hoc Working Group on the Relationship between Investment and Technology Transfer. Lastly, he stressed the importance of the coordination efforts of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development during the inter-sessional period.

The PRESIDENT said that he wished to summarize the main points that had emerged from the statements made thus far on the item. To begin with, it was recognized that the overall policy framework for the coordination of the policies and activities of the United Nations system related to science and technology for development was provided by the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development and by Agenda 21. It was also felt that a number of questions must be tackled. For instance, what should the United Nations do to address the fact that limited resources were available for science and technology? How should the subject of science and technology be approached at the national, regional and global levels, and how could a balance be struck between general and sectoral approaches? What were the roles of the Inter-agency Committee on Sustainable Development (IACSD) and the Consultative Committee on Programme and Operational Questions (CCPOQ) with regard to coordination within the United Nations system at the global, regional and country levels? How could the regional commissions best cooperate with the specialized agencies, financial institutions and other regional and subregional bodies? At the national level, how could the role of the resident coordinator be strengthened and such instruments as the programme approach and national execution be used to enhance coordination?

Moreover, how could the harmonization of the work programmes and schedules of such intergovernmental bodies as the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, the Commission on Transnational Corporations and the Commission on Sustainable Development be improved? Lastly, how could the United Nations system cooperate with other major actors, including the private

sector, non-governmental organizations, scientific and research organizations, educational and training institutions and local and community-based organizations, to serve as a catalyst for promoting science and technology in the developing countries and the world as a whole?

Mr. CLAVIJO (Colombia) said that the points raised by the President should be addressed in a Council decision, which should focus on how to ensure the coordination of already agreed programmes and on the elements in the report of the Secretary-General (E/1994/70) which had been agreed by consensus.

The Council's decision should define more clearly the differences between the functions of the Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development (DPCSD) and UNCTAD. In the light of the problems which had arisen regarding the allocation of resources, it might be desirable to include a paragraph on resources for UNCTAD in the Council's decision. In view of the shortage of resources, the Council might also wish to include a paragraph calling for follow-up to the forthcoming meeting on the pooling of resources in science and technology, which his delegation hoped would result in a clearer policy on resource allocation within and outside the United Nations system. A final point which the Council's decision should address was the role of the resident coordinator.

Mr. FLANDERS (Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development) said that his Department and UNCTAD operated very closely and that there was a clear division between their respective responsibilities. His Department had primary substantive responsibility for the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), while UNCTAD provided virtually all substantive support for the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD). His Department and UNCTAD had agreed that matters relating to coordination between CSD and CSTD were the responsibility of his Department.

In practice, that meant that the CSTD panel which was to provide input to CSD would be supported by his Department, while all other substantive support for CSTD would be provided by UNCTAD.

Mr. FLORENCIO (Brazil) emphasized that the role of science and technology in the United Nations had been minimal and marginal, a fact borne out by the figures in the report of the Secretary-General. That could be explained by the fact that science and technology required a long-term perspective and thus did not have such dramatic public appeal for the United Nations. Furthermore, since science and technology were the key factors in determining competitiveness, some countries were reluctant to encourage the transfer of something entailing so much economic power.

The emphasis must be on how to ensure a major role for science and technology within the United Nations. To achieve that goal, it was necessary to restore the importance of economic development within the United Nations, a goal which the Secretary-General was pursuing in the Agenda for Development.

He had observed two approaches to science and technology in the United Nations debate. The United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization favoured a multi-disciplinary approach, while the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations and the Secretary-General, in his report to the Council, favoured a sectoral approach.

Mr. BIONTINO (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that science and technology were always a major structural aspect of development activities, even when their impact was not immediately apparent. There appeared to be a fair amount of consensus regarding the role of the core actors responsible for coordination in the field of science and technology, although some aspects of the question could be pursued in further discussions. It was important to rely on the existing structure within the United Nations for such coordination, and he stressed the value of the task manager arrangements instituted by the Inter-agency Committee on Sustainable Development in that connection.

Mr. VENKATARAMAN (United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)) said that while he agreed that the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development and Agenda 21 illustrated the

intentions of the international community in the field of science and technology, they were more of a compendium of actions to be taken at the national level than a blueprint for direct action by the United Nations system. Moreover, some of the relevant resolutions were very broad in scope and omitted the sectoral component, which must be taken into account in any discussion of a policy framework for science and technology. Accordingly, it would be helpful if the agencies of the United Nations system, over a period of time, selected specific themes on which to focus their cooperation in that field.

As to the resources devoted to science and technology in the United Nations system, it should be borne in mind that many operational activities had science and technology components which were not separately accounted for as such. In the long run, the level of resources for science and technology could be increased by channelling resources into such activities. With regard to the approach to science and technology at the national level, while national execution was an important instrument, it must be recognized that the sectoral expertise required to strengthen the national capacity often was not available in developing countries.

Mr. BADRON (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)) said that it was important not to be misled by the figure on agency expenditures on science and technology mentioned in item 21 of the Secretary-General's report contained in document E/1994/70. Although the figure appeared very small, it did not include elements such as training and education in science and technology. He stressed that international coordination could be ensured either at the Headquarters level in New York and in the various agencies, or at the national level. He felt that coordination at the Headquarters level had been adequately addressed in Agenda 21, and was working well in UNESCO. It was common for the task manager of an agency to meet and coordinate with colleagues from other parts of the system. However, there was also an invisible component of coordination in dealing with biotechnology, AIDS and other areas of the United Nations system:

action-oriented meetings at the grass-roots level, which were not announced or dictated from the top.

He felt that the United Nations coordinator at the national level should have a key steering role in science and technology. For example, coordination between UNDP and the specialized agencies had been excellent at the higher level, but not so strong at the national level.

Mr. RUDENSKY (Russian Federation) agreed with the representative of UNESCO that coordination must be appropriate to the level at which it took place. That point needed further clarification, since coordination at the national level could take place either through the Government or through the private sector. The United Nations characteristically dealt with areas of science and technology that were related to supranational activities of primary interest to Governments, but another kind of coordination was needed for the private sector. A number of speakers had said that the problem of sustainable development was supranational and had situated such development in the field of science and technology, in case the two problems went hand in hand. While practical steps must be taken in coordination with governmental bodies, at the national level it was important to be flexible. As a universal body, the United Nations could hardly make recommendations to the private sector. Each of the three levels of coordination mentioned by the representative of UNESCO should be specific and distinct from each other in their procedures, goals and actors.

Mr. SZCZERBAN (World Health Organization (WHO)) said that he wished to clarify some of his earlier observations. The actors involved in the coordination process in science and technology were all organizations that had science and technology in their mandates. The mandate of WHO might appear to be too specific for it to be included among those actors, but it had been among the first to recognize the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to science and technology. All major discoveries in science and technology took place on the borderline between disciplines, and that would continue to be true in the future.

He agreed with the representative of Brazil that it was important to decide on the areas in which coordination should take place. It might be necessary to stimulate certain areas of development. WHO felt that the field of science and technology was developing spontaneously and might be impossible to control or direct. However, it was important to be aware of ongoing trends in order to predict what might happen in one or two decades.

It was also necessary to redirect some trends. For example, the biggest advances in medicine were taking place in the area of technology, but many of those advances were too expensive for even developed countries to afford. It was no longer possible to have one science for the rich and another for the poor. It was not always clear whether technology was being stimulated by industry or by human needs. Since political and scientific interests often differed, it was important to open a dialogue between the groups involved, in the interest of future coordination.

Mr. ROFFE (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)) said that the remarks by the delegation of Brazil had been extremely timely. Restoring the activities of the United Nations system in the field of science and technology was the responsibility not only of the Secretariat, but also of Governments. UNCTAD was engaged in cross-sectoral activities and in efforts to raise awareness of problems, emerging issues and the implications of technology. Recently, it had been attempting to involve not only governmental, but also non-governmental, actors in that process. In the light of its recent work on investment and technology, UNCTAD felt that it would be useful to institute a world dialogue aimed at enhancing understanding among economic actors and formulating new strategies for development in science and technology.

Governments should attempt to make their science and technology agendas more relevant. For example, the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, which was to meet in 1995, had adopted a vast agenda, embracing many issues, because of the need for compromise among the various actors.

Such an agenda would make organization and constructive work difficult, however.

Mr. THABIT (Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)) spoke of the need to harmonize the work of United Nations bodies with that of Member States when drafting programmes. The regional commissions were well placed to convey the particular needs of their regions to United Nations Headquarters.

Ms. IRISH (Canada) said that there had been much discussion of the need for United Nations agencies and bodies to focus on their own areas of comparative advantage, but that it was important to determine the Organization's own overall advantage in the transfer of technology, which mostly took place within the private sector or between the private sector and Governments. Both national Governments and the United Nations had a role to play in facilitating the transfer of technology, particularly in the fields of capacity-building and information systems, focusing on the national level through the role of the resident coordinator. However, it was important that the United Nations should not try to do too much. The Brazilian delegation had asked to what extent technology should be viewed from a sectoral or a cross-sectoral standpoint. Her delegation felt that technology must be viewed in terms of sectors. Interdisciplinary approaches to individual sectors were possible, but could confuse the issue. Her delegation supported the suggestion that United Nations bodies should work together; the Commission on Sustainable Development was one body whose agenda was determined sufficiently far in advance to make that possible.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.



Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1994/SR.26

14 February 1995

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: SPANISH

Substantive session of 1994

Coordination segment

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 26th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 11 July 1994, at 10 a.m.

President:

Mr. BOTEZ
(Vice-President)

(Romania)

CONTENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF HIS EXCELLENCE MR. KIM IL SUNG, PRESIDENT OF THE
DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA

COORDINATION OF THE POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND
OTHER BODIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING THEMES:
(continued)

(a) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working
languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in
a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this
document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference
Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF HIS EXCELLENCE MR. KIM IL SUNG, PRESIDENT OF THE
DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA

At the invitation of the President, the members of the Economic and
Social Council observed a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of His
Excellency Mr. Kim Il Sung, President of the Democratic People's Republic of
Korean.

Mr. KIM (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) paid tribute to
the memory of His Excellency Mr. Kim Il Sung.

COORDINATION OF THE POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND
OTHER BODIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING THEMES:
(continued) (A/49/204-E/1994/90 and A/49/205-E/1994/91)

(a) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (E/1994/70)

Mr. OBASI (Secretary-General of the World Meteorological
Organization) said that, in view of the increasing world population and the
indiscriminate use of natural resources, the current development process would
be unsound and unsustainable unless appropriate and timely measures were
adopted. Only a new pattern of development based on concern for the weaker
sectors of humanity and the environment could halt that trend. Environmental
protection required the deliberate and rational integration of science and
technology into all development processes. To that end, it was necessary to
take into account the coordination mechanisms that had evolved since the
adoption of the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for
Development, recent advances in science and technology, especially in
computers, satellites and biotechnology, and the new needs of mankind, as
reflected in the action programmes adopted at the United Nations Conference on
Environment and Development (UNCED) and the World Conference on Natural

Disaster Reduction, as well as recommendations that would emerge from the World Summit for Social Development and the International Conference on Population and Development. Such recommendations would lead to the setting of new priorities for socio-economic development, making it necessary to re-examine the existing coordination mechanisms.

Effective coordination required a three-tiered approach, namely, at the level of countries, agencies or programmes, and the United Nations system as a whole. Coordination at the national level was of paramount importance, as it determined the effective participation of Member States in the formulation of appropriate and coordinated policies and strategies for the Organization.

In some science and technology sectors, effective coordination at the national level was often lacking. For example, according to a survey carried out by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), many countries had established separate national committees to deal with climate and environmental issues; however, in many cases, the competent institutions, such as national weather services, had not been consulted in the formulation of national development and environmental plans, as called for in Agenda 21. Government authorities should review their approach with a view to ensuring optimum use of available expertise and resources through appropriate coordination mechanisms at the national level.

With regard to coordination involving United Nations agencies or programmes, each agency had set up its own coordination mechanisms for the formulation and implementation of its programmes and activities. There, too, the primary link was with the relevant national institutions of ministries designated by Member States. Experience showed that shortcomings were due mainly to ineffective national coordination, especially when the subject-matter cut across the mandates of several national ministries. A good example of a success story was the WMO World Climate Programme. An advisory panel had been established by all the United Nations agencies concerned and the International Council of Scientific Unions; its task was to advise and guide all aspects of the preparation of an integrated proposal on the Programme, to

include national programmes and activities and those of the United Nations system.

Within the United Nations system, the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) and its sectoral mechanisms were responsible for the coordinating programmes and agencies. While the Inter-agency Committee on Sustainable Development coordinated activities relating to the implementation of Agenda 21, no such mechanism had been established for the Commission on Science and Technology for Development.

Improved coordination at each of the three levels would undoubtedly contribute to optimum use of national and international expertise and technology, provided that the necessary resources were also made available. For example, if development projects were to be environmentally sound and sustainable, national meteorological and hydrological services should participate in their planning and execution. It was encouraging to note that donors were increasingly attaching importance to the environmental dimension of large-scale development projects.

Nevertheless, the funds allocated to the science and technology sector by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), which was the main funding source for such activities within the United Nations system, had decreased. Priority and resources must be assigned to that sector if it was to make its proper contribution to environmentally sound and sustainable development. Moreover, scientific and technical agencies such as WMO, which had a comparative advantage in various sectors, should be consulted in respect of the preparation of UNDP country strategy notes and World Bank reports. Such consultations would ensure that the science and technology sector was not overlooked in the funding of development projects.

In order to ensure effective coordination, ACC should establish a science and technology subcommittee; executive heads of agencies should be invited to make presentations to the Economic and Social Council or the Commission on Science and Technology for Development in their respective fields of competence.

Mr. AHMED (International labour Organization (ILO)) said that there was overwhelming evidence that the systematic destruction of the sustainable livelihoods of indigenous peoples was a consequence of environmental degradation which, in turn, resulted from distorted incentive structures and institutional biases. The evidence gathered by ILO suggested that sustainable livelihoods in ecologically fragile areas inhabited by poor people could be promoted through appropriate environmental conservation technologies.

With regard to the effort to achieve cleaner industrial production, the available data indicated that costs of compliance with anti-pollution measures did not significantly impair the economic viability or international competitiveness of polluting industries. In that connection, closer coordination between the Commission on Science and Technology for Development and the Commission on Sustainable Development would be fruitful. ILO could foster such linkages through the task manager of the Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development project on the transfer of environmentally sound technologies.

Stressing the importance of coordinated efforts in biotechnology, he said that, as shown by the ILO contribution to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) report on system activities in biotechnology, newly emerging biotechnologies had both positive and negative aspects for the poor. The United Nations system would have to make coordinated efforts to eliminate the legal and financial barriers to access by developing countries to socially beneficial biotechnologies.

ILO had endeavoured to integrate research, policy-making and project execution by establishing multidisciplinary teams to advise constituents, drawing on the expertise gained and the database established through research; that would facilitate inter-agency coordination, particularly at the country level.

With regard to locally produced technologies, ILO grass-roots programmes, which fostered linkages among end-users, commercial suppliers and

national institutions for training, credit and marketing channels, had led to more economically viable and sustainable technology use. In that area, too, United Nations system-wide cooperation at the country level would be needed.

Market liberalization, financial deregulation and privatization had contributed to the technology-driven globalization of production. The United Nations system must deal in a concerted and coordinated fashion with the international division of labour and the consequences of the global redistribution of income.

ILO had actively participated in the panels on gender and basic needs of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development. It was clear that women employed in clerical and routine tasks in the services sector were the most vulnerable to health problems caused by new technologies. ILO had documented the adverse health effects of video display terminals and had prepared guidelines in that area. Its contribution to the panel on that issue would also include strategies to prepare working women for new occupational structures. With regard to basic needs, ILO would address the question of why there did not appear to be a significant correlation between the level and growth of incomes and satisfaction of the basic needs of the poor, particularly in Africa.

The issue of endogenous capacity-building in science and technology had been one of the pillars of the Vienna Programme of Action. ILO suggested that capacity-building involved the nurturing of individual skills, the promotion of effective organizations and the application of those skills to specific ends. The issue could pose a dilemma for policy makers, as it might involve a trade-off between current and future output and employment levels.

Mr. BELHIMEUR (Algeria) said that in view of its importance, the issue of resources should be included in the document to be submitted to the Council for adoption. Referring to the period subsequent to the abolition of the Task Force on Science and Technology for Development, whose functions, as noted in the Secretary-General's report, had been absorbed partly by the Inter-agency Committee on Sustainable Development (IACSD), with respect to the

science and technology aspects of Agenda 21, and by the Consultative Committee on Programme and Operational Questions (CCPOQ), he said that the issue of a single inter-agency coordination structure should be clarified, since no replies had yet been received. Concerning the division of labour between the Commission on Transnational Corporations and the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, he referred to paragraph 65 of the Secretary-General's report, which stated that UNCTAD was now the secretariat of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development and that the Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development was responsible for the coordination of inputs. Since no assessments had been made of the issue thus far, he wondered whether the representatives of UNCTAD and the Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development could comment on the matter. Since some members of the Group of 77 had raised the issue of South-South cooperation in the context of science and technology, he wished to know whether the United Nations system intended to address the issue, which had not been included in the Secretary-General's report.

Mr. KHAN (Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development) said that since the abolition of the Task Force on Science and Technology for Development, IACSD had been responsible for coordinating tasks within the United Nations system with respect to the implementation of Agenda 21, and CCPOQ dealt with issues of science and technology in general, and operational activities of the system at the national level in particular, as well as with the coordination between the various programmes relating to science and technology.

Mr. FLANDERS (Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development) observed that UNCTAD provided substantive support to the Commission on Science and Technology for Development. The Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development was responsible for coordinating the activities of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development and the Commission on Sustainable development. It also participated actively in the meetings of the Bureau of the Commission on

Science and Technology for Development and provided, in particular, substantive support to a panel of the latter Commission responsible for preparing a report for the Commission on Sustainable Development. There were also ongoing fruitful consultations between the Department and UNCTAD.

Mr. BELHIMEUR (Algeria) said that he would appreciate some clarification concerning the scope of the secretariat services currently provided by UNCTAD to the Commission on Science and Technology for Development and the Commission on Transnational Corporations. He wished to know whether those services were simply technical and operational such as the provisions of interpretation services, or covered other types of services as well.

Mr. ROFFE (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)) said that UNCTAD worked closely with the Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development and expressed gratitude for the support provided by specialized agencies, especially ILO, UNIDO, UNESCO and WHO, to the panels established by the Commission on Science and Technology for Development. Concerning the division of labour, he referred to paragraph 65 of the Secretary-General's report, describing what had happened since the restructuring of the United Nations in the economic and social sectors, and noted that the action undertaken by the Secretariat had been in accordance with the General Assembly's guidelines concerning the restructuring of the Secretariat in the area of science and technology. UNCTAD maintained excellent cooperation with the Department and, despite existing constraints, excellent results were being achieved. The substantive support provided to the Commission, including helping with the preparations for the work of various panels established by the Commission and the various activities of the programme of work was worth noting. In particular, the Department provided special support to the panels on sustainable development. However, restructuring had caused a number of problems and the UNCTAD secretariat was preparing a report thereon for submission to the Fifth Committee. As far as the work of the Commission on Transnational Corporations in the area of science and technology was concerned, he noted that although the Commission

had conducted work in the area of transfer of technology it was not entrusted with a specific role in that area. As to South-South cooperation in the area of science and technology, UNCTAD was seeking to strengthen the links among research and development institutions in developing countries; if it had the necessary resources, it would be able to do much more in that area.

Mr. CLAVIJO (Colombia) said that the functions relating to science and technology for development were broad and could not be restricted to the issue of the environment alone. The coordination of activities between the Commission on Sustainable Development and the Commission on Science and Technology for Development should be enhanced and the respective mandates of the Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development and UNCTAD should be clarified. That was very important as far as resources were concerned. The problems facing science and technology for development activities had to do with the allocation of resources and were not of an institutional nature. While environmental issues were important, Colombia felt that they should not absorb all the attention of the Commission on Sustainable Development. The resources earmarked for UNCTAD activities should be allocated in a rational way since the proper allocation of resources for the execution of programmes in the field would benefit the developing countries.

Mr. BIONTINO (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that coordination was needed not only at the national, local and regional levels but also throughout the system. Sectoral issues should be harmonized and integrated in order to coordinate science and technology activities throughout the system. He suggested that within the framework of the Inter-Agency Committee on Sustainable Development, sectoral issues should be coordinated by the respective task managers and that UNCTAD should be responsible for their integration. Such integration and coordination should not be limited to environmentally-sound technology, but should also cover all activities in the field of science and technology.

1...

Ms. WILLIAMS-MANIGAULT (United States of America) said it was important to consider the comparative advantages that various sectors of society could offer in the area of science and technology and, concerning the coordination of United Nations activities system-wide in that area, it was necessary to determine which measures were most appropriate. Science and technology could not be discussed in isolation, for the issue required specific sector-by-sector treatment in order not to lose sight of the purpose of the technology to be transferred nor of ways of promoting development. Project heads should seek a clear formulation of the programmes approved for implementation.

Mr. CLAVIJO (Colombia) said that in preparing the document to be considered, the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Relationship between Investment and Technology Transfer should be taken into account, since they dealt specifically with the treatment of the issue system-wide and had been endorsed by UNCTAD.

Mr. VENKATARAMAN (United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)), referring to the transfer of technology, said that the UNIDO secretariat had participated in the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group and had drawn its attention to ongoing activities undertaken by various organizations, including UNIDO, in that area. The issue of coordination in that field was different from coordination in the area of science and technology in general and should be kept separate. He also recalled that the UNIDO statement had mentioned the need to examine the issue of technology together with topics such as investment viability studies and others that made up the many sectoral activities and that delegations should bear that in mind in adopting decisions on the issue. He had also listened with interest to the comments of the representative of Germany, speaking on behalf of the European Union, and the representative of the United States concerning the importance of sectoral activities and the need to consider certain aspects relating to the transfer of technology and investment from the sectoral viewpoint. He therefore hoped that a distinction would be made between the issue of

coordination in the area of science and technology in general and the issue of coordination of specific aspects such as the transfer of technology and investment.

Mr. KHAN (Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development), referring to the proposal put forward by the representative of Germany concerning the mandate of the Inter-Agency Committee on Sustainable Development, said that currently that mandate was confined to the implementation of Agenda 21 and specifically, to the consideration of science and technology issues, while task managers were responsible for the coordination and formulation of programmes relating to the execution of Agenda 21 on behalf of the Inter-Agency Committee. Therefore, if the Council felt that the proposal of the Germany delegation was the best approach and recommended that it should be approved, that would mean that the mandates of the Inter-Agency Committee and of the task managers would have to be expanded or amended and the Administrative Committee on Coordination would have to adopt that approach, which in turn would have an impact on the other bodies of the Administrative Committee, particularly the Consultative Committee on Programme and Operational Questions.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.



Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1994/SR.27
14 February 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Substantive session of 1994

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 11 July 1994, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. RIVERO

(Venezuela)

CONTENTS

COORDINATION OF THE POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND
OTHER BODIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING THEME:

(b) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM AGAINST THE
ILLICIT PRODUCTION, SALE, DEMAND, TRAFFIC AND DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS
AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working
languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in
a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this
document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference
Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

COORDINATION OF THE POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND OTHER BODIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING THEME (A/49/204-E/1994/90, A/49/205-E/1994/91):

(b) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM AGAINST THE ILLICIT PRODUCTION, SALE, DEMAND, TRAFFIC AND DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES (E/1994/58, E/1994/95)

Mr. GIACOMELLI (Executive Director, United Nations International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP)) said that the misconception that drug control was solely of concern to the law enforcement and health sectors, and to the countries that were directly affected, had been dispelled and replaced by a more comprehensive understanding of the issue. It was now necessary to address the issue of system-wide coordination. That goal must be reassessed on a regular basis; changes in global sentiment, technical discoveries, and unforeseen trends must all be taken into account. The drug control debate must be placed in a more comprehensive and multidimensional context. Otherwise, there was a risk that the illicit drug problem would permanently outgrow the system's ability to contain it.

In response to resolution 6 (XXXVII) of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, UNDCP had initiated preparations for an analysis of ways and means to strengthening system-wide cooperation and coordination in the light of existing mandates. The main objective would be to identify the components of other programmes which could usefully include drug-control activities. It was already clear that United Nations agencies would not be able to determine how they could better contribute to the system-wide effort unless they had a precise understanding of the drug problem from a global point of view. UNDCP, as the focal point for all United Nations drug-control activities, had an

important role in that regard. One of its main priorities would be to clarify the conceptual parameters of the illicit drug problem.

In order to lay the foundations for a true and sustainable partnership, United Nations counterparts must recognize the fundamental goals of international drug control. Many of the goals pursued by UNDCP, particularly in such areas as human development, environment and finance, were similar to those pursued by other United Nations entities. Drug control was not limited to policing or medical treatment. Effective drug control meant steering children away from a life of crime and misery, promoting the reintegration of addicts into civil society, helping peasants make a better life, helping countries recover from the ravages of war, preventing financial systems from being infiltrated by criminal organizations, stemming environmental decay and stopping the spread of AIDS. It was only with a shared notion of those objectives that it would be possible to carry out a common, system-wide effort in which each organization played an active part.

The United Nations System-Wide Action Plan on Drug Abuse Control (SWAP), in its current form, had reached the limits of its potential. The reasons which had prevented it from developing into a fully useful instrument were the same as those which had hindered inter-agency coordination in the field of drug control. In order to sensitize other partners to shared, system-wide interests, UNDCP had prepared two documents for the World Summit for Social Development, one on the social and economic impact of drug abuse and control, and the other on the links between drugs and development. In addition, it had recently conducted a study on the socio-economic impact of illicit opiates in Pakistan; that study demonstrated that many of the tools of economic analysis could also be applied to drug control.

In the policy dialogue carried out by UNDCP with the programmes, funds and specialized agencies of the United Nations system, a dual-track process of convergence was needed. On the one hand, goals must be further defined at the executive level of their respective secretariats. On the other, experience had shown that the channel of inter-agency dialogue must be expanded,

particularly at the field level. Operational ties should be strengthened on a country-by-country basis in the context of country-level programming consolidation; policy tools like the country strategy notes should increasingly dovetail with national drug-control master plans formulated by Governments, policy framework papers of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and UNDCP Country Programme Frameworks. There could even be cases where inter-agency planning at the field level should accelerate prior to the conclusion of Headquarters formalities. UNDCP's field offices network had recently expanded, and UNDCP would now be able to rely on UNDP resident representatives as well.

The efforts described in the report on the status of international cooperation in drug abuse control within the United Nations system (E/1994/58) represented the first steps in a process expected to be further analysed and developed.

It was essential for UNDCP to build on its partnership with the World Bank and IMF. With the World Bank, and also regional development banks, there was potential for establishing an enhanced division of labour in countries where development and drug-control needs intersected. Illicit drug production and consumption could be effectively addressed through cooperation with the World Bank, since education was a common preventive instrument.

Closer ties were needed with IMF because of the increasing impact which drug-tainted money had on the international financial system; money laundering caused balance-of-payments distortions, and the activities of criminal organizations had disturbing implications for the conduct of monetary policy and for the validity of conventional economic indicators. IMF input in that area of analysis was essential.

Mr. GRAF zu RANTZAU (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly, many speakers had agreed that since the drug problem had spread to virtually all countries, it would not be solved without international cooperation.

The European Union supported the System-Wide Action Plan on Drug Abuse Control, but felt that its effectiveness must be assessed and was disappointed that only a few agencies had submitted agency-specific implementation plans. The leadership role to be played by UNDCP was a key element of the Plan; since UNDCP depended largely on voluntary contributions it was important that Member States provide it with sufficient resources. Moreover, other funding agencies and the international financial institutions must include elements of the System-Wide Action Plan in their overall strategies and their specific country programmes and must consult UNDCP. Maximum effort would be achieved only if all organizations operating in the field combined their efforts into a tailored approach in line with the national master plans.

The European Union was pleased that UNDCP had been admitted to the meetings of the Joint Consultative Group on Policy (JCGP) and also hoped that the results of the discussions of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) could be made available to the Council for consideration at its 1995 substantive session.

It was important to encourage cooperation with international organizations outside the United Nations system. The European Union felt that the work of the International Narcotics Control Board was particularly important. The international anti-drug conventions were the legal backbone of the global fight against drugs, but a number of States were not yet party to them, while others had ratified the conventions but had not yet enacted implementing legislation. Drug traffickers were quick to move their operations to such countries. This situation must be remedied, and the European Union hoped that the ad hoc intergovernmental advisory group established by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs would make recommendations for implementation of existing international drug control instruments. The European Union was particularly concerned with coordination between UNDCP and the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch, whose activities were of direct importance to the fight against illicit drugs.

In closing, he appealed to all States to increase their voluntary contributions to UNDCP.

Mr. FLORES OLEA (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the Group of Three (Colombia, Venezuela and Mexico) said that the Group firmly supported all initiatives and actions undertaken by the international community to develop international cooperation in the fight against drugs. The exacerbation of the drug phenomenon was alarming: consumption was growing, and efforts to reduce demand and rehabilitate addicts were still inadequate. Measures to combat money-laundering, illegal arms traffic and diversion of chemical substances must be strengthened. The high-level debate at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly had demonstrated the complexity of the drug problem and the firm political will of State to combat it.

The updated SWAP should include an annex with programmes of the agencies, and should particularly stress the important role which should be played by international financial institutions in promoting stability and economic development and combating the drug industry. That involvement was essential in combating drugs in the medium and long term. Judging from the information reproduced in the report of the Secretary-General (E/1994/57), the specialized agencies did not appear to have made a special effort to coordinate their activities; that was regrettable. The multi-agency paper on the social and economic consequences of illicit drug production, trafficking and abuse (para. 32) should be completed as soon as possible so that it could be taken into account during the negotiations on the political declaration and programme of action to be adopted at the end of the World Summit for Social Development. The report of the Secretary-General on the status of international cooperation in drug abuse control within the United Nations system (E/1994/58) showed that much still remained to be done.

The Group of Three agreed that it was important for all countries to comply fully with the commitments made at the multilateral level and to carry out action at the national level; such action would constitute a solid basis for the success of coordination efforts in the United Nations system. With

its broad knowledge and experience, UNDCP had a solid basis for drawing up a strategy to promote drug control activities throughout the United Nations system. The priorities defined by the international community in the various instruments on the subject and in the resolutions which had been adopted should help guide those efforts. The Group of Three fully supported resolution 6 (XXXVII) of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs requesting the Executive Director of UNDCP to analyse further ways and means of strengthening system-wide cooperation and coordination and supported the request for him to draw up guidelines to enable UNDCP better to fulfil its catalytic role. The Group was gratified that UNDCP and UNESCO had recently signed a memorandum of understanding to exchange information and cooperation in questions relating to the prevention of drug use through education and information. Such agreements were useful instruments for improving coordination among agencies of the system, and the possibility should be explored of signing similar agreements with other agencies, for example, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) which could concentrate, in particular, on international cooperation in the reduction of demand.

The experience acquired by regional bodies in certain aspects of drug control should be enhanced through greater cooperation and coordination with United Nations bodies. For example, mention might be made of the model rules developed by the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission within the framework of the Organization of American States. However, it was also necessary to systematize the agreements on international cooperation in the area of drug control in order to gain an overall view of international efforts and facilitate the coordination of agencies and cooperation with Member States. In that respect, the exchange of information was critical. Among the actions identified in part III of the report of the Secretary-General (E/1994/58), those involving dialogue with international financial institutions, the strengthening of inter-agency mechanisms and field coordination were of particular importance.

/...

Mr. EDGREN (Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau for Policy Planning and Evaluation, United Nations Development Programme) said that with the introduction of special programme resources like for drug abuse control the possibilities of supporting pilot activities and integrating drug-abuse control into UNDP's sustainable human development activities had improved considerably. However, given the limited resources - \$3.5 million - in relation to overall need, UNDP had focused the programming of those special resources on aspects related to sustainable development objectives, with priority given to poverty, gender and community-based programmes. UNDP support at the national level was provided through technical assistance programmes, the UNDP field office network and execution by the UNDP Office for Project Services (OPS). Most of UNDP's technical assistance activities had been in the Asia-Pacific and Latin American and Caribbean regions.

UNDP had also suggested that a section of the United Nations System-Wide Action Plan (SWAP) should be devoted to important multi-sectoral programmes which supported control and prevention, as such an approach would facilitate coordinated programming with other relevant United Nations agencies under the leadership of the resident coordinator. A revised working arrangement had been agreed between UNDP and UNDCP in October 1993 providing the framework for sharing responsibilities in the field. Country offices had also begun more systematic inter-agency consultations leading to the inclusion of quick-impact projects related to drug control.

Mrs. HORIUCHI (Japan) said that Japan would continue to demonstrate its unwavering commitment to the international struggle against drug abuse by making a contribution in the current year of \$5,500,000 to the drug control programme. She hoped that UNDCP would not only make effective use of those resources but would also mobilize more resources from relevant international organizations and bodies within the United Nations system. The international financial institutions, in cooperation with the United Nations Drug Control Programme could play an important role in strengthening alternative development schemes which were regarded as an effective means of

promoting sustainable social development in poverty-stricken areas. Furthermore, those institutions, together with the international community should also actively address the money-laundering problem in the context of their efforts to end drug trafficking. The communique issued following the recent meeting of the Group of Seven confirmed the determination of the seven major industrialized nations to fight money-laundering in connection with the problem of illicit drugs. Since reducing demand was just as important as controlling supply, UNDCP, in cooperation with other relevant international organizations, should expand its educational campaigns to heighten public awareness of the use of illicit drugs, assist Member States in building an effective system of law enforcement to control the use of drugs and elaborate effective policies to eliminate transnational drug sales and trafficking.

Mr. CAMARA (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)) said that the drug abuse problem could not be eliminated or reduced without comprehensive national programmes which were closely linked to collaborative international efforts. The responsibility given to UNDCP under General Assembly resolution 45/179 for coordinating and providing effective leadership for all United Nations drug control activities was aimed at coordinating such activities across the United Nations system. In response to the Mexican representative's statement, he noted that FAO and UNDCP had signed an updated memorandum of understanding. He stressed the need for continued discussion on the implementation of inter-agency projects and activities so as to ensure that each agency focused on the component parts where its particular strengths and expertise could be effectively employed. In that connection, FAO had prepared an agency plan as part of the System-Wide Action Plan. A three-page annex to his statement outlined the areas of interest to FAO and its projects and activities.

Mr. GELBARD (United States of America) said that despite the progress made since the establishment of SWAP in 1990, most United Nations agencies still had difficulties translating their commitment under the Plan into action. The United Nations drug control activities were all too often a

series of uncoordinated projects and the challenge of enhancing the conditions for global economic and social development by controlling international drug trafficking was not met because many countries rejected the concept that the narcotics trade drained and distorted national economies. His Government firmly believed that on both developmental and anti-narcotics grounds, the World Bank, regional and multilateral development banks, the United Nations development agencies and the international community as a whole must assign a higher priority to combating drug production and trafficking because it created serious macroeconomic distortions, particularly in weak economies, ate away at social and economic development and diverted resources.

The United States would work closely with the multilateral development banks to integrate drug control objectives into developmental aid. The United Nations agencies should promote broad-based growth that ensured that drug producers had viable income and employment alternatives and that rural communities had the strength to resist pressure to produce narcotics. Successful sustainable development initiatives gave drug producers the choice of switching to legitimate enterprises or fighting the State. In that connection, as strong judicial systems were essential to destroy violent and economically powerful drug syndicates, promotion of respect for the rule of law and human rights was critical.

Concerning the role of United Nations agencies in general in drug control, UNDP must monitor its programmes carefully in order to ensure that they did not contribute to or support drug production. UNICEF could design projects to help drug-addicted and at-risk children while UNESCO could increase awareness of the environmental damage associated with drug production.

As the world's largest illicit drug market, the United States recognized that its first obligation was to address its own drug problem. Consequently, 88 per cent of the \$13.2 billion that President Clinton had requested for drug control would be used to fight domestic drug use and trafficking. More emphasis than ever before was being put on demand reduction. United Nations

Member States must speak with one voice and work through the specialized agencies to give high priority to drug control. United Nations drug control efforts must be comprehensive.

Mr. VOICU (Romania) said that international law was crucial to multilateral cooperation which was the linchpin for any positive effort in the fight against drug abuse. In that connection, improving coordination between international and national drug control efforts was critical. That was why his delegation supported a balanced, integrated and global strategy implemented in cooperation with Governments, non-governmental organizations, the private sector and society as a whole. The economic and political power of drug cartels involved in various types of violent organized crimes was growing and countries which were not parties to international treaties and were affected by both political instability and economic depression were particularly likely to come under their sway. UNDCP must play a key role in the promotion of a partnership between beneficiaries and donors of technical assistance and stress the need to tailor national policies, strategies and regulations to the specific needs of the efforts to combat drug trafficking. Active involvement by the international institutions in the global strategy to fight drugs was an overriding imperative. Regional organizations and arrangements such as the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) and the Council of Europe could contribute to the global effort against money-laundering and drug trafficking. The opening of Romania's borders in 1990 had made it vulnerable to drug traffickers. While there was still no market for the sale of drugs in his country, it was being used for the illegal transit of drugs. His Government had taken a number of vigorous measures including the promulgation of new legislation and the establishment of an inter-ministerial coordination body to combat that scourge.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan) said that Member States should be involved in the formulation and implementation of the various proposals from the earliest stages so as to remove the possibility of any friction due to a lack

of understanding of proposed plans. The current system of communication with Member States, both at the general conceptual level and technical level, should be improved because enhanced awareness would definitely have a positive impact on the allocation of resources for drug control activities. While UNDCP was playing a central role, its powerful mandate was unfortunately not matched by adequate resources. Member States must increase their voluntary contributions to strengthen the role of UNDCP.

One of the successful pioneering efforts that had been made through inter-agency agreements to promote coordination was the establishment of the information inter-agency group on drug control matters in Islamabad referred to in paragraph 25 of the Secretary-General's report (E/1994/57). Pakistan accorded the highest priority to coordination within the State machinery and with sub-regional, regional and international mechanisms. In 1989, a separate ministry, the Narcotics Control Division, had been created which was supported by the Anti-Narcotics Task Force and the Pakistan Narcotics Control Board. Tough measures had been taken in recent years to destroy laboratories and punish drug traffickers and considerable efforts were being focused on the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts and mass education on the effective prevention of drug abuse. His country was fully cooperating with the Member States of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) to combat drug trafficking and had signed and ratified the relevant SAARC Convention. Pakistan firmly believed that the partnerships could bloom into meaningful cooperation if development agencies integrated drug control activities into their systems. Those activities could in turn be integrated into the overall framework of the United Nations Drug Control Programme

Mr. TROTTIER (Canada) said that in order for UNDCP to play its primary role of leading and coordinating all United Nations drug control activities, it required commitment and cooperation from other United Nations agencies, including the international financial institutions. His delegation welcomed the activities undertaken by the United Nations system under the System-Wide Action Plan on Drug Abuse Control; it also welcomed the agreements

between UNDCP and FAO and UNDP, as well as the other agreements planned. His country was encouraged by the fact that the arrangement with UNDP involved the sharing of responsibilities at the field level and by the more systematic inter-agency consultations undertaken by some UNDCP field offices. It was also pleased to note the increasing cooperation between UNDCP and the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch. However, more could be done.

His delegation was disappointed that some United Nations bodies had not provided input in time for consideration by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs in April 1994 concerning their activities related to the System-Wide Action Plan or an indication of forward-looking agency-specific implementation plans. Although admittedly the time-frame for the submission of that input had been short, UNICEF, FAO, the World Bank, IMF and the Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development should have been involved in the process. His delegation hoped that the observer role now played by UNDCP within the Joint Consultative Group on Policy would encourage greater coordination and integration of drug abuse control into the policies and activities of other United Nations bodies. It noted with interest that drug abuse control would be a separate agenda item at the forthcoming session of the Administrative Committee on Coordination. In conclusion, he underscored the importance of coordination at the national, regional and international levels in order significantly to reduce and ultimately eradicate the cultivation, manufacture, traffic in and use of illicit drugs and the abuse of licit drugs.

Mr. MAYRHOFER-GRUNBUHEL (Observer for Austria) said that document E/1994/58 was refreshingly frank in describing the System-Wide Action Plan as a patchwork of drug-related projects and in noting that the length of progress reports in the United Nations system tended to be in inverse proportion to the progress being reported. The report identified all the major elements for the success of UNDCP's coordination efforts.

He understood the crucial coordination and leadership role of UNDCP and said that coordination meant enlisting the cooperation and goodwill of the

partners and establishing a framework within which they could coordinate their activities. Appropriate drug information systems were very important in that regard. Training, which in some contexts was better referred to as "awareness raising", was particularly useful at the country level, and his delegation encouraged UNDCP to systematically arrange seminars for resident representatives in the countries most directly concerned in order to emphasize the importance of building drug control elements into UNDP country programmes. UNDCP also should ensure the uncompromising professionalism, reliability and impartiality of its own staff and strive to overcome any remaining management problems. Successful coordination ultimately depended on the coordination of government policies in the various international organizations in which countries participated.

Donors, too, should be concerned with coordination and should speak with one voice in the relevant international forums. They also should strive to ensure that drug-control efforts undertaken by bodies outside the United Nations system did not duplicate the work under way within the system. His delegation was pleased that recent contacts between the Financial Action Task Force and UNDCP had paved the way for a clear division of labour between them and hoped that a similar division could be agreed upon with the European Union and the Pompidou Group.

His delegation strongly endorsed the statement delivered on behalf of the European Union concerning coordination with the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch. UNDCP also should actively endeavour to obtain an overview of all international drug control activities and keep the international community involved, highlighting perceived instances of duplication, with a view to avoiding overlapping or duplication of work.

His delegation strongly supported the master plan concept and the bottom-up approach. It congratulated UNDCP on its excellent report and particularly appreciated the fact that the Executive Director had, in referring extensively to the World Summit for Social Development, established the indispensable social context of the drug problem.

UNDCP had clearly identified the basic elements of a workable strategy for coordination. All components of the United Nations system should support the effort, and his delegation looked forward to the meeting of the Administrative Committee on Coordination on the issue scheduled for the spring of 1995. By that time, it was to be hoped that the System-Wide Action Plan would have developed into a workable framework for coordination and cooperation at all levels.

Mr. AHMED (Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)) said that thus far ESCAP had focused on the demand side of drug control. Its experience had shown, however, that demand reduction should not be examined in isolation from the supply side of the drug problem. ESCAP's Indicative Plan of Action on Drug Demand Reduction focused on information requirements, national policy-making and coordination mechanisms, drug abuse prevention measures and regional collaboration. ESCAP and UNDCP had collaborated in a number of regional and subregional activities to implement the Indicative Plan.

In the field of policy-making and coordination, ESCAP actively supported UNDCP's master plan approach. The organization and implementation of all ESCAP's community-based drug demand reduction interventions had been fully coordinated with the demand reduction activities outlined in the master plan.

In the field of drug abuse prevention, ESCAP implemented a subregional strategy as part of the Global Programme of Action adopted by the General Assembly in February 1991. Demand reduction activities were under way in border areas in China and Myanmar, and similar work was about to start in border areas of Myanmar and Thailand. Subregional activities for the Pacific countries were also under consideration.

The establishment of a regional UNDCP centre in Bangkok permitted an ongoing exchange of information and experience to reduce the risk of duplication of efforts, particularly in the South-East Asian subregion. A constant dialogue, in particular, with the other UNDCP field representatives in the Asia-Pacific region, including those in India, Pakistan and Uzbekistan,

was required in order to maximize the comparative advantage of each organization. ESCAP therefore welcomed the UNDCP initiative to convene expert forums on demand reduction in South Asia later that year and in South-East Asia, South-West Asia and Central Asia in 1995 and 1996. ESCAP's collaboration with UNDCP in drug abuse control was well established at the operational and policy levels. In order to improve cooperation with other United Nations bodies, specialized agencies and related organizations, ESCAP had convened an Inter-agency Meeting on Strengthening Coordination at the Regional Level in May 1994. The Meeting had decided to establish an ad hoc mechanism on collaboration for which UNDCP would act as the lead agency. ESCAP also looked forward to collaboration on policy development at the regional and subregional levels and welcomed the development of agency-specific implementation plans for inclusion in the updated System-Wide Action Plan on Drug Abuse Control.

Mr. YE Dabo (China) said that it was important to review the status of international cooperation in drug-abuse control within the United Nations system given the economic, political, social, environmental and other challenges posed by the drug problem. Integrated measures were needed, not only in order to strengthen coordination and cooperation, but also to permit concerted and forceful actions. He commended UNDCP on its achievements thus far. Many of the suggestions contained in document E/1994/58 were both practical and necessary. His delegation agreed that top priority should be given to clarifying the strategic goals and priorities of UNDCP and the United Nations system. Those goals and priorities should be based on the priorities and goals determined at the national and regional levels. In recent years, UNDCP had provided appropriate strategic direction in fostering subregional drug control cooperation. He referred in that connection to a number of agreements on cooperation in drug control involving countries in Asia. His delegation supported UNDCP's efforts to strengthen its cooperation with other agencies and further promote subregional cooperation.

His delegation hoped that the System-Wide Action Plan would be further strengthened and that the United Nations would enhance its cooperation with all relevant agencies, including human rights agencies, with a view to improving the coordination of drug-control policies. It also agreed that it was essential to enhance coordination of drug-control efforts at the national level. Countries should be encouraged to adhere to the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988.

Mr. BAKJAJI (Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA)) described the radical transformation which the social structure of Western Asia had been undergoing and said that social, economic and political developments in the region had aggravated the drug abuse problem. The increase in drug abuse among youth was of particular concern. Since the region covered by ESCWA included areas of drug production and transit, efforts to reduce supply and trafficking generally received higher priority and greater resources than those aimed at stemming demand. Nevertheless, the drug supply and trafficking in the region had been increasing steadily.

ESCWA's activities in the field of drug abuse control had been limited in scope owing to limited resources and to the emphasis placed on social development issues. However, a comprehensive study carried out in 1992 on demand and supply reduction had evaluated national policies, programmes and services for reducing drug abuse and its findings would provide guidelines for the development of national policies and programmes in the region. A follow-up study published in 1993, financed by UNDCP and the United Nations Youth Fund, had examined epidemiological aspects of drug abuse among youth in the region and had evaluated available prevention, treatment and rehabilitation services, including reintegration programmes in selected countries. With regard to regional cooperation, ESCWA had signed an agreement with the Arab Security Studies and Training Centre at Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, for future collaboration in crime prevention and drug abuse control in the region.

Although all the countries of the region had laws dealing with drug abuse, their programmes and policies were fragmented. Only limited health education programmes existed in some countries, and there were inadequate rehabilitation facilities and prevention programmes. In many countries, the private sector dealt with drug abuse, which meant that most services were inaccessible to the majority of drug abusers.

Mr. SAHRAOUI (Observer for Algeria) commended UNDCP on its achievements in combating drug abuse and said that the resources and means at its disposal should be augmented. Nevertheless, as the report of the Secretary-General indicated, much remained to be done, at the national and intergovernmental levels and within the United Nations system. Commitments at the national level were as important as effective action by the United Nations system. At the national level, the political will to combat the drug problem must be supported by strategies which could be translated into master plans, the establishment of executing bodies and increased monitoring of drug-related activity. The ratification of the relevant international instruments would strengthen the effort.

His delegation agreed with the recommendation in document E/1994/58 (para. 40) that the process for preparing master plans and UNDCP's capacities in that regard should be reviewed and consideration given to a specific budget or source of funds for UNDCP support to the process. Those steps were particularly important since the developing countries, in particular, the least developed nations, including those of Africa, did not have the means to prepare master plans. Lastly, the proposal to establish an information database within UNDCP and its partner United Nations organs was welcome, although it fell short of the recommendations in General Assembly resolution 48/112, in particular, section IV, paragraphs 7 and 8.

Mr. REZVANI (Observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran) said that drug abuse was a serious challenge to the international community. The last decade had seen a dramatic increase in illicit drug activities and drug

related crimes; drug abuse was costly on both the economic and the human level.

The drug control campaign could not be won without concerted international action. In line with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 48/12, the members of the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO) attached great importance to the role of the United Nations and in particular that of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme, in coordinating international activities for control of illicit drugs. The latter United Nations International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP) should monitor implementation of the Global Programme of Action which outlined action to be taken at the national, regional and international levels.

The Islamic Republic of Iran supported the idea of master plans for combating illicit drug activities but recognized that limited financial resources would hamper the preparation of such plans in some countries. Since UNDCP had no specific budget for pursuing the initiative of master plans, countries able to do so must provide the necessary financing.

Illicit drug production and trafficking created problems for countries in the ECO region. As such activity became more lucrative, drug-trafficking groups had become more professional and better financed. The ECO member countries had decided to prepare a comprehensive regional plan for combating this threat and to establish a committee for the prevention of drug abuse. The objectives of the Committee were to increase cooperation among ECO member States, to involve all the members, particularly the Central Asian republics, in combating drug abuse, to control the illicit traffic in drugs, to cooperate in rehabilitation of addicts, and to enhance cooperation with United Nations agencies, the Customs Cooperation Council and the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL). The UNDCP Regional Office for South-West Asia had initiated a memorandum of understanding for strengthening drug law enforcement capacities in border areas between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Pakistan. His delegation hoped that with international assistance, such initiatives could be extended to the other countries of the ECO region.

/...

Mr. CHAMBERS (International Labour Organization (ILO)) said that drug abuse was a major threat which not only endangered individual health and welfare, but reduced the possibilities for human development and productivity. Drug-related criminal activities deprived individuals of their basic human rights, and drug traffickers exploited poverty to promote cultivation of illicit crops.

Alarmed by the mounting threat that drug abuse posed for human rights, ILO would support all international drug control activities; however it could make its greatest contribution in the area of demand reduction. Activities must be carried out on two levels: elimination of the root causes of drug abuse through development of human resources and improved working and living conditions, and assistance to individuals who had fallen victim to drugs, and their families. ILO would provide community services, public information and education to discourage drug use.

ILO followed two major lines of activity in drug abuse control: rehabilitation programmes to assist recovering addicts in social integration through work, and prevention and assistance programmes in the workplace to reduce drug and alcohol abuse among workers. Previously the emphasis had been on punishment and isolation of the addicts, which was both expensive and counterproductive. Interaction between the recovering addict and the community was essential. The recovering addict must adjust to family life, build new social networks, and find and hold a job. For the worker, drug abuse could mean loss of job and income and breakdown in relations with other workers; it entailed anguish for the worker's family, expense for society, and a serious liability for employers since it gave rise to accidents at the workplace and loss of productivity. But the workplace was also an appropriate context for addressing the problem.

There must be interaction between initiatives in the workplace and rehabilitation programmes in the community; ILO was following that approach in some 40 countries in cooperation with other United Nations agencies and international organizations. Collaboration between ILO and UNDCP was

particularly fruitful; it was based on a partnership approach and focused on aspects of the demand reduction continuum in which ILO had experience; ILO had contributed to the System-Wide Action Plan and felt that a partnership approach was the key to the future of the Plan.

The series of subregional consultations which had been launched by UNDP provided a concrete opportunity for demand reduction. Such collaboration was a perfect means of development of inter-agency action within the System-Wide Action Plan in response to the needs of Member States.

Ms. LAHNALAMPI (Observer for Finland), speaking on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Finland, said that since UNDCP depended primarily on voluntary contributions, its role should be primarily that of a catalyst. A distinction must be made between general coordination and coordination of specific projects and programmes. More intensive coordination at United Nations Headquarters level and at regional and country levels was required, and a more integrated approach was needed.

At the field level, the United Nations institutions must ensure consistency with the efforts of other international institutions, and the narcotics issue must be integrated into the country strategy notes. The United Nations resident representatives should promote synergy of drug control activities among the organizations of the United Nations system, including the International Financial Institutions (IFIs). Drug control programmes could be integrated into health, education and rural development project so as to increase the impact of multilateral drug control efforts. She appealed to all countries to increase their voluntary contributions to UNDCP.

Mr. ORDZHONIKIDZE (Russian Federation) said that the globalization of the phenomenon of drug abuse was giving rise to legitimate concern in the international community. Narcotic drugs were a threat not only to the health and lives of millions of people, but also the political stability of States. In the Russian Federation, the situation had sharply deteriorated in recent times. Trade in narcotic drugs had amounted to \$150 million in 1993 and drug-related crime had increased by 83 per cent compared with the figures for 1992.

The increasing attention paid to Russia by the international drug business was linked with its geographical situation at the intersection of transport routes and the potentially large demand for narcotic drugs, as well as the open borders within the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS).

In 1993, an outline for a State policy on drug control had been adopted in the Russian Federation, as a basis for a long-term national drug abuse control strategy in the legislative, law-enforcement, customs and health spheres, and in questions of international cooperation. On that basis, a programme of comprehensive measures to combat drug abuse and illicit trafficking had been formulated for 1994-1996. Existing anti-drug legislation was also being improved and brought in line with international standards.

The strengthening of regional cooperation in drug abuse control was a major goal of the Russian Federation, which was actively involved in collective action within the Council of Europe; great efforts were also being made to establish a collective protection system within CIS. Since 1992 there had been an agreement on cooperation among the internal affairs ministries of 13 CIS States in controlling illicit trafficking in narcotic and psychotropic substances. In Moscow, a bureau to combat organized crime in the CIS countries had been established which was also concerned with combatting the drug business.

No efforts at the national, bilateral and regional levels would yield the desired results unless they were reinforced at the global level. The United Nations had a unique contribution to make to cooperation in that area and was the centre of coordination of international action. The experience acquired by the United Nations should be effectively used at the national level. A key role in determining overall anti-drug policy should continue to be played by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. Russia had taken an active part in formulating the recommendations and decisions at the Commission's thirty-seventh session and, in particular, supported the Commission's balanced approach to the supply and demand of narcotic drugs, halting illicit traffic in narcotic substances, and socio-medical issues of the treatment of drug

addicts. At the same time, it firmly opposed attempts to legalize the non-medical use of narcotic drugs and remove them from strict State control. The Russian Federation was prepared to take an active part in the working group on maritime cooperation. His delegation believed that it would be worth taking up the useful ideas and proposals put forward by the Chairman of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

His delegation supported the efforts of UNDCP to develop SWAP. The formulation of guidelines to enable UNDCP to fulfil more effectively the role of coordinator and catalyst of activity in that sphere by other agencies and bodies of the United Nations system should be accelerated. The Russian Federation also hoped that UNDCP would show a greater understanding of its problems and would pay attention to the implementation of projects already identified. For its part, Russia was prepared to continue its cooperation, including cooperation in identifying new long-term areas of joint action.

His delegation shared the concern that over 20 years since the adoption of the convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971, some of the main producer and exporter countries had still not become parties to it and had not introduced appropriate measures of control. That situation undermined the operation of the international system of control. Russia was in favour of universal membership in the basic international anti-drug conventions.

Work was being completed on Russia's adherence to the 1972 Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961. At the same time, his delegation believed that consideration should be given to formulating a new universal convention which would combine all the existing multilateral treaties on narcotic drugs. Efforts to improve the system of international cooperation in combating narcotic drugs would be successful only if the largest possible number of States took part in that process. The Russian Federation, for its part, was prepared to continue to contribute to strengthening that process.

Ms. ARYSTANBEKOVA (Observer for Kazakhstan) said that her delegation supported the basic recommendations made in the Secretary-General's

report (E/1994/58) and fully agreed that increasing efforts must be made by the entire world community to counter the global drug threat. In its statement on behalf of the member States of CIS at the high-level debate at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly her delegation, recognizing the need for international action, had stressed the coordinating role of the United Nations and its specialized agencies in solving the global problem of narcotic drugs. Her delegation agreed that UNDCP had a special role to play in ensuring coordination and effective leadership within the United Nations system. It was essential that coordination efforts should be directed towards common strategic goals and priorities and should be carried out on the basis of a common understanding of the scale and nature of the problem of narcotic drugs within the framework of agreed strategies at the international, regional, subregional and especially national levels. Her delegation also agreed that coordination efforts should be preventive in nature, and should promote measures that were mutually reinforcing.

Her delegation appreciated the work carried out by UNDCP to give more practical content to the work of the United Nations in that area, strengthen its coordinating function and provide assistance to the countries with economies in transition, particularly of the Commonwealth of Independent States. In May 1994, the Executive Director of UNDCP had visited Alma Ata in order to study the drug situation in the region and discuss a broad range of problems linked with the cultivation, production, transport and trade of narcotic substances. Special attention had been paid to the problem of controlling the transit of chemical components and with particular reference to equipment necessary for drug manufacture, and to the drug situation in Kazakhstan and the country's geographical situation. Concern had been expressed that in the very near future the potential of the Chu valley in southern Kazakhstan could be used by local and international drug dealers to considerably increase the production and consumption of narcotic drugs (over 138,000 hectares in the valley were devoted to hemp cultivation). In the course of the visit, international aspects of Kazakhstan's cooperation in drug

abuse control, the drug situation in the world and the efforts of the world community to combat the drug trade at the regional and international level had been discussed. Agreement had been reached on providing Kazakhstan with the latest world information on the problems of drug abuse control, training and refresher training for specialists from the relevant ministries of the Republic, and legal consultations on improving Kazakhstan's legislation in controlling the drug business. Her Government was particularly grateful that UNDCP was considering the possibility of allocating financial resources in support of Kazakhstan's state drug control programme. Kazakhstan was willing to further develop its close cooperation with UNDCP and other specialized agencies and bodies of the United Nations system.

Mr. ANSARI (India) praised the work of UNDCP and its Director in coordinating drug control activities within the United Nations system. In order to be addressed comprehensively the drug menace must be seen in its totality. His delegation favoured cooperation between the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, under the aegis of UNDCP, in order to tackle all aspects of the drug problem, including terrorism, money laundering and arms trade.

Drug abuse affected all economies and societies, both developed and developing, and was a threat to the development process in developing countries. UNDCP, in collaboration with other relevant organizations, should assess the impact of illicit drug production, trafficking and abuse, alternative development schemes in areas of illicit cultivation, and the fight against money laundering and related crimes.

His delegation stressed the importance of cooperation between UNDCP and the intergovernmental organizations and States concerned. The role of UNDCP in promoting the System-Wide Action Plan should not undermine the importance of the Global Programme of Action. Regional approaches to the drug problem could succeed only if all aspects were analysed and if full cooperation of the countries involved was attained.

His delegation supported the Secretary-General's suggestion that a drug information database should be set up under UNDCP auspices to cover the spread of AIDS, juvenile crime, drug cartels, terrorist activities, drug-related arms trade and money laundering, financial and criminal organizations involved in drug-related transactions, new roots of the drug trade, and Government policies for drug control.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.